Remarks

Reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks. No claims are amended, but new claim 53 is submitted for consideration. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-9 and 41-53 are in the application.

Claims 1-9 and 41-52 stand rejected as obvious in view of a combination of Vazvan, U.S. Patent 6,324,394 and Bodin, U.S. Patent 6,387,027. This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 recites a method of organizing a search for a service provider in a wireless device storing location information. The method comprises, at power down of the wireless device, erasing at least part of the location information associated with a recently used service provider. Vazvan and Bodin, taken alone or in any combination, fail to teach such a method. Vazvan, at col. 5, lines 9-13, is cited as disclosing erasing at least part of the location information associated with a recently used service provider. This is incorrect. The cited portion of Vazvan teaches deleting a temporary number (TN) assigned by another operator when a new number is assigned by a new operator:

> If the user or the mobile terminal selects another network, a new TN is allocated to it by the new operator, whereafter the previous TN can be deleted from the previous visitor location register VLR (belonging to another operator) and from the memory of the mobile terminal.

Thus, while a temporary number is provided by an operator, the temporary number does not correspond to location information associated with a recently used service provider as recited in claim 1. Location information is associated with identification of a service provider, not a temporary number that is allocated to a subscriber or a mobile terminal by a service provider. In addition, even if Vazvan taught or suggested location information, as noted in the Office action, Vazvan does not teach or suggest deletion of location information at power-down of a mobile station. Bodin fails to cure the deficiencies of Vazvan. According to Bodin, a predetermined number of rejected mobile networks (PLMNs) is stored, and a list of rejected PLMNs can be erased when the mobile terminal is switched off.

> When attempts to register on a visited PLMN where roaming is not allowed, a roaming rejection is received from the visited PLMN to an antenna 5 connected to the mobile

equipment. The mobile equipment then writes the identity of that visited PLMN onto a list 4 in the SIM card. . . . According to the invention an additional list 6, which is volatile, is provided preferably in the storage 3. The volatile list 6 functions as an extension to the non-volatile list in the SIM. . . . Since the list 6 is provided in a volatile storage 3 it is automatically erased when the mobile station is switched off. This allows the mobile station one attempt on the PLMNs not in the non-volatile storage list 4 in the SIM but prevents repeated attempts. Col. 3, lines 21-48.

In contrast, claim 1 recites erasing location information associated with a recently used service provide, not a list of rejected networks. Thus, Bodin not only fails to teach or suggest erasing location information associated with a recently used service provider, Bodin teaches away from erasing such information. Accordingly, claim 1 is properly allowable. In addition, all remaining claims are properly allowable as dependent from allowable claim 1.

New claim 53 is submitted for consideration. Claim 53 recites, in part, a method that includes identifying a plurality of recently used service providers, storing location information associated with the plurality of recently used service providers, and at power down of a wireless device, erasing the location information associated with the plurality of recently used service providers. No combination of Vazvan and Bodin teaches or suggests such a method. Vazvan teaches allocation of temporary numbers to a user by a network, and does not teach or suggest storing location information associated with a service provider. Bodin teaches erasing portions of a list of PLMNs that do not allow registrion, i.e., erasing information concerning service providers that are not used. Thus, claim 53 is properly allowable.

Attorney Reference Number 6541-62121-01
Application Number 09/742,313

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, all pending claims are in condition for allowance, and action to such end is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By   _____
Michael D. Jones
Registration No. 41,879

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446